REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action mailed on August 2, 2011. This response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to express his gratitude to the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on September 8, 2011, with the undersigned, in which the prior art was discussed.

Claim 44 stands objected due to an informality. This has been corrected by appropriate amendment as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 35-41, 44-52, 54, 60-66 and 81 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. (US 6011554) in view of Goren (US 7190351).

Applicant traverses the above rejections. The present invention has different structure and functionality than the cited art, examples of which are now explained.

As the Examiner correctly points out, King does not group the keys on different sides of the device. The Examiner combines Goren with King because Goren in Fig. 24B has keys on different sides of the device. However, Goren is fundamentally different than King and fundamentally different than the instant invention. Both King and the instant invention teach the use of keys with more than one letter, which causes ambiguity as to which letter the user desires to select. Goren explicitly teaches away from such ambiguity, as Goren clearly denounces such systems in the background:

"Cell phone input of information via small alphanumeric keys is cumbersome, slow and inaccurate, and multitapping on telephone keypads is awkward. Reduced keyboard disambiguating programs are usually inefficient, prone to error and often require the user to choose from a long list of potential words to find a word that is derived from any certain combination of keystrokes. This requires pressing a sequence of keys and then filtering the word out from a list. Additionally, the device may need to use a large amount of storage capacity in order to process this information. Also, disambiguating programs may be less useful when more than one language is used. Another problem is the cost and placement of the button-type alphanumeric keyboard on a device such as a cell phone, so that it does not take away space from the small display screens found on the device. The newer Internet enabled PDA-cell phone hybrids need an improved input method and system to best realize their potential."

Thus it is respectfully deemed improper to combine King with Goren. The skilled artisan is taught by Goren to reject the King system, as quoted above. Thus, the rejections are respectfully deemed overcome.

In addition, the instant invention has different structure than King and certainly than Goren. For example, in one of the embodiments of the instant invention, all the letters are allocated to just four keys, and these ***four keys are operative to disambiguously generate all the letters of the language***. For disambiguation, King requires a separate select key. Claim 40 has been amended to recite this patentably different structure. The basis for this amendment is as follows:

The embodiment of four keys is described, for example, in paragraph [0583]:

"[0583] According to one embodiment of the invention, still fewer number of keys may be used to contain alphabetical letters (and other symbols as described before) and being used with the press and speak data entry systems of the invention. FIG. 45c shows as an example, four keys 4530-4533 having English alphabetical characters assigned to them. To keep this arrangement familiar, the QWERTY arrangement of the letters of the top two rows of the keypad 4520 of the FIG. 45b are maintained and the letters of the lowest row of said keypad 4520 of the FIG. 45b are distributed within the keys of the corresponding columns (e.g. left, right) of said four keys 4530-4533 in a manner to maintain the familiarity of an "almost QWERTY" keyboard along with high accuracy of the voice recognition system of the invention. For example, letters "n" 4537 and "m" 4538 which have been located on the lowest right key of the keypad 4520 of the FIG. 45b, are here separated and assigned, respectively, to the right keys 4533 and 4532 of the keypad 4530. It is understood that other symbols such as punctuation marks, numbers, functions, etc., may be distributed among said keys or other keys of a keypad comprising said alphabetical keys and be entered according to the data entry system of the invention as described in this application and the applications filed before by this inventor."

The keys themselves are used to disambiguously generate a particular letter / word. This is described, for example, in paragraph [0172]:

"[0172] Of course, instead of using a voice/speech, a behavior of a user combined with a key interaction may select a symbol. For example, a user may press the key 102 heavily and swipe his finger towards a desired symbol."

New claims 83 and 84 have been added to recite this patentable difference, as well, based on the above quoted paragraph [0172] and claim 83 also covers paragraph [0170]:

"[0170] If the user does not speak, a predefined symbol among those candidated symbols, may be selected as default. In this example, the punctuation "," shown in a box 103 is selected. To select one of the other candidated symbols, for example the letter "B", the user may speak said letter."

As another example, King and Goren are silent about HOW the letters are assigned to keys. The skilled artisan has no information from King and Goren how to arrange the letters on the keys. In contrast, the instant invention explains how to arrange the letters on the keys. For example, as stated in the specification:

"[0570] With continuous reference to this embodiment, said alphabetical letters may be distributed on the keys of said keypad in a manner to locate ambiguous letters on different keys. FIG. 44b shows as an example, a QWERTY arranged keypad 4407 with minor modifications. In said keypad, the key assignment of the letters "M" 4408 and "Z" 4409, are interchanged in a manner to eliminate the ambiguity between the letters "M" and "N". In this example, the QWERTY configuration has been slightly modified but by using said keypad with the data entry system of the invention, the recognition accuracy may be augmented. It is understood that any other letter arrangement and modifications may be considered."

As one example from the above passage, the allocation of letters to a particular key is based on the shapes of the letters, as quoted above: "In said keypad, the key assignment of the letters "M" 4408 and "Z" 4409, are interchanged in a manner to eliminate the ambiguity between the letters "M" and "N"." Claim 82 has been added to recite this feature, which is deemed patentable over the prior art.

Claims 85-94 have also been added and are differently worded versions of the above features.

Accordingly, claims 35-41, 44-46, 48-50, 52, 54, and 81-94 are respectfully deemed allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DEKEL PATENT LTD.
/David Klein/

David Klein, Patent Agent
Reg. No. 41,118
Tel 972-8-949-5334
Fax 972-949-5323
E-mail dekelltd@netvision.net.il